



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CAESAR B. G. 2.11 AGAIN.

Professor Knapp's note upon Caesar B. G. 2.11 (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 45), while unquestionably correct in respect to the general interpretation of the passages cited, seems to me most unfortunately misleading in the treatment of *cum*. The source of the difficulty which we encounter in the interpretation of *cum* is the fact that there is in English no colorless conjunction by which to represent it. In the clause *cum ab extremo agmine . . . consistent*, etc., is it not manifest that *cum* is an absolutely colorless word? Perhaps the clause can be accurately rendered in English only by a participial phrase: ' . . . killed many of them in the retreat, the rear, as our men came up, halting and valorously beating off the attack, but those in the van, because they thought themselves remote from the danger and were under no restraint or authority, breaking ranks when they heard the shouting and making tracks as fast as they could'. This clause adds a semi-paratactic descriptive statement about the retreat of the Belgians. To read into it a 'when', a 'since', or an 'although', and above all to find in it two of these adverbial relations, to my mind not only is erroneous, but will ruin the fine sensing of *cum* in many another passage.

(Parenthetically, one may wonder, if the greater part of the butchering were done among the van at the same time that fighting was going on in the rear, how that part of the enemy could seem to themselves *abesse a periculo*. Is it not more probable that the van escaped unscathed? One must remember that this was a tremendous horde of men,—some 330,000¹ (it required eight miles of land to accommodate their camp); whereas Caesar's entire force in service at the time was probably less than 25,000. But this is apart from the point at issue, for this "hint to the wise" can be read with equal ease into either interpretation).

In the other citation (B. G. 1.20) I believe that *cum* is (descriptively) temporal without a scintilla of either causal or concessive significance: 'because, at a time when Diviciacus had great influence as the result of his popularity, and Dumnorix had very little because of his youth, Dumnorix had gained in standing through Divitiacus's succor'.

This is in no way opposed, in either passage, to the finding of an antithetical relation between the two parts of the clauses, which is not indicated in Latin but which might be expressed in Greek by μέν-δέ. (In the latter sentence, however, the contrast seems to me so weak that it would be overdone even by the English adversative conjunction 'but'). My two points are (1) that if there is any antithesis between the parts of either sentence it is left entirely to the reader to divine and *cum* has nothing to do with it: and (2) that *cum* may be so

entirely free of any causal, concessive, or temporal significance that the Roman writer is not conscious of any inconsistency or zeugma even when he uses the conjunction but once with two or more clauses that can not possibly have the same adverbial relation to the main sentence.

BARCLAY W. BRADLEY.

I reply briefly to Mr. Bradley's note, for various reasons. First, I have been somewhat surprised that there have not been more discussions in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY of passages within the ordinary preparatory school reading; I think such discussions might be helpful. Secondly, it is clear that Mr. Bradley did not quite understand my previous remarks on this passage.

I do not think Mr. Bradley helps matters much in his first paragraph, by suggesting that we adopt but a vague rendering for *cum* in 2.11. Abstractly he is right, in warning us against too precise rendering of *cum*. Yet, concretely, I differ from him here. I am one of those who dislike most heartily vague conjunctions, such as 'while', and the absolute participial construction in English; my dislike is in part due to aesthetic considerations, in part to my feeling that nothing should be done or allowed that will prevent thought.

Nor did I read into *cum* in 2.11 two different senses, as Mr. Bradley implies at the end of his first and his third paragraphs. I took *cum* as causal; the 'although' comes from the antithesis between the parts of this causal clause, exactly as Mr. Bradley says, and as I sought to say or imply in my former note.

I do not think Mr. Bradley's suggestion that the *van* escaped is in harmony with the passage; it was certain *fugientes*, plainly, that were killed. These *fugientes* cannot have been those *ab extremo agmine*, for we are expressly told that they stood their ground.

We learn also that the killing of a great host of the foe was for the Romans *sine ullo periculo*; it was, therefore, a very different operation from that in which some withstood the Roman attack.

Mr. Bradley forgets that, since *videor* often enough equals our verb 'fancy', Caesar is himself in his *viderentur* calling attention to the absurdity of their notion that they were out of the danger zone. The modern reader can hardly be asked to account for the wild notion of Caesar's foes. Further, the smallness of Caesar's force has nothing to do with the number of the slain; in Roman warfare it was the cavalry, never numerically a very strong part of the whole force, that did the butchering of the enemy. To me, then, the chapter clearly indicates that it was the van that suffered, and at the hands of the cavalry.

CHARLES KNAPP.

¹ Cf. B. G. 2.4.